Appl. No. 10/595,447 Amdt. Dated October 26, 201 Reply to Office action of July 26, 2010 Attorney Docket No. P18714-US1 EUS/GJIP/10-7706

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

Applicant amends claim 1 to address alleged informalities identified in the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are currently pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Examiner Objections - Claims

Claims 1 and 8 are objected to because of informalities. In particular, the Office Action objects to claim 1 because a "network" allegedly does not fall into the categories of "process," "machine," "manufacture," and "composition of matter." Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. For purposes of advancing prosecution, however, Applicant amends claim 1 as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 1.

The Office Action also objects to claim 8 because the "Currently Amended' label was not updated in the most recent Response to Office Action. Applicant agrees that the label was incorrect as no amendments were made to claim 8 in the most recent Response to Office Action. Because claim 8 was previously amended in prior responses, however, claim 8 is now labeled "Previously Presented" in the present Response to Office Action. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 8.

3.) Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP-TS-33-200 (3GPP TS 33.200 V5.0.0 Release 5 March 2002) ("3GPP") in view of Loganathan, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,536,183) ("Loganathan"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The proposed 3GPP-Loganathan combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of the rejected claims.

For example, claim 1 recites:

Appl. No. 10/595,447 Amdt. Dated October 26, 201 Reply to Office action of July 26, 2010 Attorney Docket No. P18714-US1 EUS/GJP/10-7706

A telecommunication network system having at least a gateway node, with a first domain comprising:

a mobile application part protocol instance connected to the gateway node configured to send and receive mobile application part messages in accordance with the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) Technical Specification (TS) 33.200, the gateway node being connected to a second domain, wherein the gateway node is configured to receive a mobile application part message from the first domain, to convert the received mobile application part message obtaining a secured mobile application part message, and to send the obtained message to the second domain, the gateway node further being configured to receive a secured mobile application part message from the second domain, to extract an unsecured mobile application part message from the received secured mobile application part message and to send the extracted message to the first domain.

The proposed 3GPP-Loganathan combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of claim 1. For example, the proposed 3GPP-Loganathan combination fails to disclose a gateway node being configured "to receive a mobile application part message from the first domain, to convert the received mobile application part message obtaining a secured mobile application part message, and ... further being configured to receive a secured mobile application part message from the second domain, to extract an unsecured mobile application part message from the received secured mobile application part message from the received secured mobile application part message" (emphasis added) as recited by claim 1.

In attempting to address these elements of claim 1, the Office Action provides only a conclusory assertion that "element 114" of Loganathan converts a MAP message to an allegedly more secured GSM MAP message. See Office Action at p. 4. This assertion is completely unsubstantiated by the cited portions of the references, which do not discuss the security of MAP and GSM MAP messages. The cited portion of Loganathan simply states that "the mobile application part protocol translator can be operative to receive a message in a TIA-41 mobile application part protocol and translate the message to a corresponding message in a GSM mobile application part protocol." Loganathan at col. 4, II. 49-53. The cited portion does not indicate anything about how secure either MAP or GSM MAP messages are. Thus, the Office Action provides no evidence to support the assertion that GSM MAP messages are more secure than MAP messages. Consequently, the proposed 3GPP-Loganathan

Appl. No. 10/595,447 Amdt. Dated October 26, 201 Reply to Office action of July 26, 2010 Attorney Docket No. P18714-US1 EUS/GJP/10-7706

combination fails to disclose any gateway node configured "to receive a mobile application part message from the first domain, to convert the received mobile application part message obtaining a secured mobile application part message, and ... further being configured to receive a secured mobile application part message from the second domain, to extract an unsecured mobile application part message from the received secured mobile application part message from the received secured mobile application part message" (emphasis added) as recited by claim 1.

As a result, the proposed 3GPP-Loganathan combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of claim 1. Although of differing scope from claim 1, claim 6 includes elements that the cited references fail to disclose, teach, or suggest for reasons analogous to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Claims 1 and 6 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 6, and their respective dependent claims.

Appl. No. 10/595,447 Amdt. Dated October 26, 201 Reply to Office action of July 26, 2010 Attorney Docket No. P18714-US1 EUS/GJIP/10-7706

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Todd A. Cason, Reg No 54,020/

Todd A. Cason Registration No. 54,020

Date: October 26, 2010

Ericsson Inc. 6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11 Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8510 todd.cason@ericsson.com